

NOTE: This order is nonprecedential.

United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

In re: LAKSHMI ARUNACHALAM,
Petitioner

2019-112

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus to the United States District Court for the District of Delaware in No. 1:16-cv-00281-RGA, Judge Richard G. Andrews.

ON PETITION

PER CURIAM.

ORDER

Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam petitions for a writ of mandamus “to correct void order(s) the trial court(s) had no power or jurisdiction to render” and to compel “District and Appellate Courts[] to comply with the Law of the Land as delineated in *Fletcher v. Peck*, 10 U.S. 87 (1810), [and] uphold Contract Laws of the Land and Patent Prosecution History.” She also moves to waive the court’s filing fee.

Dr. Arunachalam’s petition appears to be seeking relief concerning a case she brought in the United States District Court for the District of Delaware against Inter-

national Business Machines Corporation, SAP America, Inc., and JPMorgan Chase & Co., alleging patent infringement and violations of the RICO Act. She also amended her complaint to name the assigned judge, Judge Richard G. Andrews, as a defendant.

The district court ultimately dismissed Dr. Arunachalam's claims, denied her motion to file an amended complaint, and denied her motions for recusal. She appealed on June 22, 2018 (Appeal No. 2018-2105), and this court affirmed the judgment of the district court on January 28, 2019. Dr. Arunachalam is currently seeking review at the Supreme Court. *See Arunachalam v. Int'l Bus. Mach. Corp.*, App. No. 18A857.

Mandamus is an extraordinary remedy, available only where the petitioner shows: (1) a clear and indisputable right to relief; (2) there are no adequate alternative legal channels through which she may obtain that relief; and (3) the grant of mandamus is appropriate under the circumstances. *See Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Court for the Dist. of Columbia*, 542 U.S. 367, 380–81 (2004).

Dr. Arunachalam has already appealed from the orders in question, and it appears this court has already considered and rejected the arguments she raises in her petition. She could have filed a timely request for rehearing, but failed to do so. As such, it is clear that her request for mandamus relief must be denied.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

(1) The petition is denied.

(2) The motions to waive the court's filing fee are denied as moot.

IN RE: ARUNACHALAM

3

FOR THE COURT

March 27, 2019
Date

/s/ Peter R. Marksteiner
Peter R. Marksteiner
Clerk of Court

s35